

a simple matter of routine maintenance on equipment. If we would like the U.S. military of the future to remain the world's preeminent fighting force, then, the stakes are much higher. As Russia rattles its saber and develops weapons such as hypersonic cruise missiles and quiet submarines, we need to continue funding for research and development of our own cutting-edge capabilities.

We have to provide for the modernization of infrastructure and update defenses against cyber threats so that China's ever-bolder meddling in this domain cannot bring about the cyber hegemony it craves. We cannot turn our back on our interests and partners in the broader Middle East. In Afghanistan, Syria, Yemen, Somalia, and beyond, we face ongoing terrorist threats. Iran's violent aggression certainly highlights the need for vigilance and for strength. All of this is necessarily more difficult if we don't fund the military's modernization and readiness. The stakes are too high for us to fail.

We cannot afford to abdicate our responsibility to deliver timely funding to the critical priorities of the Federal Government, least of all to the men and women in uniform who keep us safe. So I would urge each of my colleagues to engage in this process, honor our agreement that we made just 1 month ago—just a month ago—and keep us on track to deliver for our country.

#### RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

#### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of John Rakolta, Jr., of Michigan, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the United Arab Emirates.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

#### CONTINUING RESOLUTION

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, as negotiations continue on a continuing resolution to keep the government open past next week, we should be laying the groundwork to process the 12 appropriations bills for fiscal year 2020.

In an ideal world, the Republicans on the Appropriations Committee would be negotiating in good faith with the Democrats on the Appropriations Committee to determine the allocations and the content of those bills, but the Republicans, unfortunately, have not chosen to do this. They are acting in a totally partisan way. The Republicans have chosen to back the President's demand for an additional \$12 billion in funding for his border wall, taken from other sources, including medical research, opioid treatment, and funding intended for our military, their families, and their kids. Mexico, oddly, isn't chipping in a penny.

This was all done totally on the Republican side with there having been no consultation of the Democrats and, certainly, no buy-in. So, of course, the Democrats oppose taking funds from Congress to use on the President's border wall that have been intended for our military. Everyone knows that. In fact, 12 Senate Republicans opposed the very same thing this year, but in typical Washington, blame-game fashion, Republican leader MITCH MCCONNELL has been accusing the Democrats of threatening to block military funding because we don't want to pass a bill that steals money from the military. That is right. The Democrats are the ones threatening not to vote for this bill because we oppose a Republican bill that would shortchange the military.

I have heard some howlers in my day, but that is pretty rich, what MCCONNELL is saying.

Leader MCCONNELL constantly talks about stunts. He doesn't like stunts because they won't be signed or passed into law. This is a stunt if I have ever seen one, that of putting this bill—\$12 billion more for the wall and with no buy-in by the Democrats—to a vote. It will lose. We know it will lose.

What is the point, Leader MCCONNELL? You say you don't like stunts. You say you don't want to bring bills to the floor that won't become law. Well, this one certainly won't.

The fact is the Republican leader knows well that the Democrats oppose taking funding away from our troops to use on the President's wall. He knows that Members of his own caucus oppose taking money out of their States to spend on the President's border wall. Some have been quite vocal; yet Leader MCCONNELL is moving forward with the bill all the same, knowing that it lacks votes.

For him to say the Democrats are the ones threatening to block military

funding when, in fact, we oppose a Republican bill that would shortchange the military is the height of double talk by the Republican leader.

Again, the Republican leader is fond of reminding the press that he doesn't like to engage in stunts—that the Senate is for making laws and is not a forum for political theater. Yet putting this bill on the floor of the Senate that everyone knows lacks the votes is the definition of a stunt.

Leader MCCONNELL—and I mean this with all due respect—it is time to negotiate. Both sides must sit down and have a serious negotiation—no stunts, no blame game. The Democrats want to work with our Republican colleagues, but we need a willing partner, and time is quickly running out to get a bipartisan appropriations process back on track.

#### BACKGROUND CHECKS

Madam President, now, on guns, a week and a half after our return from the August work period, Senators from both sides of the aisle are still waiting to hear what the President proposes in order to combat the epidemic of gun violence. According to reports, the President's yet-to-be-released plan will likely not include universal background checks or even a significant expansion of background checks. If those reports are true, it will be a profound shame.

Without closing the loopholes in our background check system, most other gun safety measures, like emergency risk protection orders, would be severely compromised. Background checks must be the base, the foundation, of gun safety legislation. If background checks aren't included, we will still be allowing guns to fall into the wrong hands—those of convicted criminals, domestic abusers, the adjudicated mentally ill.

You can have one of these emergency risk protection orders issued to someone—let's say to Mr. John Smith. Yet, if we don't close these loopholes, John Smith, the next day, will be able to go online and get a new gun because there will be no background check, and the seller of the gun will have no way of knowing there will have been a protection order against him. Without having background checks, a lot of this other stuff isn't going to do the job. It isn't going to save the most lives that we can.

I hope the President thinks long and hard before releasing a proposal that falls short of making meaningful progress, particularly on background checks.

In the past, Republican Senators, Congressmen, and candidates promised action after mass shootings, only to have announced support for legislation that was specifically designed not to offend the NRA. We have seen that before.

This is a chance for the President to do something different and, frankly, something courageous. It would be a terrible shame if he were to squander that very much needed opportunity. If